DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 106 424 UD 015 160

AUTHOR	Falk, William W.; Cosby, Arthur G.
TITLE	School Desegregation and Educational Attitudes: A Quasi-Experiment in Rural Schools.
SPONS AGENCY	Texas A and M Univ., College Station. Texas Agricultural Experiment Station.
PUB DATE	Aug 73
NOTE	32p.; Revised version of Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rural Sociological Society (College Park, Maryland, August 1973)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Aspiration; Educational Attitudes; *High School Students; *Integration Effects; *Longitudinal Studies; *Negro Students; Occupational Aspiration; Racial Attitudes; Research Design; Role Perception; Rural Youth; School Integration; School Role; School Segregation
IDENTIFIERS	Texas

ABSTRACT

This study seeks an answer to one broad question, "Do black children who attend racially desegregated schools, have educational aspirations and expectations which are significantly different (either higher or lower) from black children who attend racially segregated schools?" To facilitate this, the study not only examines the educational aspirations and expectations of youth, but also examines their perceptions of race and schools attended as impeding their life chances. The study used an accidental quasi-experimental design. Data were obtained from a six year panel of rural Texas black youth with interviews taken at the sophomore (1966), senior (1968) and past high school (1972) years. In 1966, all students were attending segregated schools; however, by 1968 approximately one-half were in desegregated schools. This allowed comparisons of before measures (1966); comparison of short-run effects (1968); and comparison of long-run effects (1972). While neither educational aspirations nor educational expectations were affected to a significant degree, the desegregated group was more likely to define their life chances in racial terms and also saw the schools they had attended as being more detrimental than did the segregated group. Possible interpretations of the findings are provided. (Author/JM)

ED106424

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION AND EDUCATIONAL ATTITUDES: A QUASI-EXPERIMENT IN RURAL SCHOOLS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

By

William W. Falk and Arthur G. Cosby

Texas A&M University

Revised version of a paper presented at the Rural Sociological Society annual meeting, University of Maryland, College Park, August, 1973. Development of this paper was sponsored by the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station as a contribution to TAES Project H-2811 and USDA (CSRS) Research Project S-81, "Development of Human Resource Potentials of Rural Youth in the South and Their Patterns of Mobility." Appreciation is expressed to Bonnie Burris, Randi Cole and Leslie Rust for their assistance in the preparation of this manuscript, and to John Womack for his programming assistance. Appreciation is also expressed to Melvin Knapp, T. Michael Carter, Bardin H. Nelson, J. Steven Picou and Michael Miller, all of whom provided helpful criticisms and suggestions for the revised version of the paper. The authors, of course, assume responsibility for all deficiencies in the manuscript.

UD 015160

ABSTRACT

Using Jenck's *Inequality* as a point of departure, this study investigated the effects of school desegretation on the educational attitudes of black youth in an accidental quasi-experimental design. Data were obtained from a six year panel of rural Texas black youth with interviews taken at the sophomore (1966), senior (1968), and post high school (1972) years. In 1966 all students were attending segregated schools, however, by 1968 approximately one-half were in desegregated schools. This allowed comparison of before measures (1966); comparison of short-run effects (1968); and comparison of long-run effects (1972). While neither educational aspirations nor educational expectations were affected to a significant degree, the desegregated group was more likely to define their life-chances in racial terms and also saw the schools they had attended as being more detrimental than did the segregated group. Possible interpretations of the findings are provided.

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION AND EDUCATIONAL ATTITUDES: A QUASI-EXPERIMENT IN RURAL SCHOOLS

Ever since the 1954 Supreme Court ruling in Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka, there has been much speculation on the effect of desegregating the public schools. The almost twenty years which have elapsed since the Supreme Court's landmark ruling have been generally characterized by (1) a reluctance of school districts to adhere to the Court's ruling and (2) a lack of notable empirically-based studies on the desegregation phenomenon. The two most highly visible exceptions to this latter point have been the work of Coleman et al., (1966) and Jencks et al., (1972), both of which have received extensive criticism. It is the intent of this report to examine, in particular, selected findings and inferences from the more recent work of Jencks.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In general, the present study seeks an answer to one broad question, "Do black children who attend racially desegregated schools, have educational aspirations and expectations which are significantly different (either higher or lower) from black children who attend racially segregated schools?" To facilitate this, the study not only examines the educational aspirations and expectations of youth, but also examines their perceptions of race and schools attended as impeding their life chances. In every case the problem is to compare segregated and desegregated populations to see if any differences are observed.

There is, of course, a much broader problem to which this study addresses

itself; namely to help expand the present knowledge base about the effects of segregation versus desegregation. Stated differently, this study's objective is to provide information on a social phenomenon about which relatively little is known and which has important policy implications. As Jencks has pointed out:

> It is easy to construct theories showing either that desegregation will make things better or that it will make them worse. Past experience can also be cited to support either view. Our own prejudice is that in most contexts desegregation will probably increase tension in the short-run and reduce it in the long-run. But we have no real evidence for this. (Jencks, 1972:156)

The present paper will have been of utilitarian value if for no other reason than that of providing additionally needed 'evidence'. Further this evidence will be provided so that desegregation effects may be observed in the short-run (i.e., after two years) and in the longer-run (i.e., four years after anticipated high school graduation or put differently, six years after experiencing the initial desegregation process; the temporal aspect is more understandable if Illustration 1 is examined).

DEFINITIONS OF CONCEPTS

For present purposes, there are at least five concepts which must be given some consideration. These concepts are (1) equal opportunity, (2) educational aspirations, (3) educational expectations, (4) integration, and (5) desegregation. While economy of space prohibits lengthy discussion of any one concept or any pair of concepts, the following discussion is meant to clarify the use of these terms in this paper.

Even a cursory reading of the literature which discusses equal

opportunity leads one to conclude that conceptual clarity is lacking and that any one definition utilized will be problematic. The concept is most often discussed in an evaluative context; thus the criteria most often mentioned in attempting to operationalize the concept may be generally referred to as: (1) inputs, (2) outputs, and (3) a combination of inputs and outputs. (For examples of the ways in which the concept could be and has been operationalized, see Coleman, 1968:9-24; Guthrie, et al., 1971:2-5;93;138-139; Gordon, 1972:423-434; Jencks, 1972:3-15; Mosteller and Moynihan, 1972:6-7.) The present paper is most in accord with the conceptualization which emphasizes outputs -- a position presently favored by many other authors as well. (Substantiation of this may be found in the previously cited references.) Coleman (1966 and 1969), Jencks (1972), and Gordon (1972) would all agree that it is outputs (i.e., results as indicated, for example, by achievement tests, aspirations, or attainment) which have the most significant implications for a better understanding of social mobility. This receives further support from researchers studying status attainment. In particular, the models of Sewell et al., (1969 and 1970) include such variables as mental ability and grade point average.

Aspirations and expectations have been conceptually differentiated by a number of authors, most often in the study of occupational choice (Blau, et al., 1956; Stephenson, 1957; Glick, 1963; Kuvlesky and Bealer, 1966; Rehberg, 1967). The work of Kuvlesky and Bealer has been frequently cited by researchers studying within the status projection area of interest. (See the bibliography of Cosby et al., 1973.)

While their work was primarily intended for use in the study of occupational choice, the same conceptual differentiation has been used in the study of other types of status projections. The primary difference between the two concepts is found in the desirability in orientation toward either an aspiration or an expectation as a goal. A person's educational aspiration is generally thought to be more or less desired; however, the person need not necessarily desire the education which he actually expects (as opposed to aspires) to attain. For present purposes the distinction made by them has been found to be useful and thus has been employed in this study.

One other term is in need of clarification. Throughout this paper the term desegregation will be used as opposed to the term integration. This is in keeping with the usage employed by Jencks. Jencks differentiated the two concepts as follows, "Desegregation is defined as housing black and white students under the same roof. Integration is defined as knitting the two groups into a single social community." (Jencks, 1972:98; a similar argument has been made on this by other authors. See for example, Carter, 1964; Pettigrew, 1968; McPartland, 1968; Weinberg, 1970.) In the present study there has not been sufficient data on the students' patterns of interaction to justify the use of the term integration, at least as Jencks and others have defined it, thus the use of the term desegregation.

INFERENCES FROM JENCKS' *INEQUALITY*

While there is a voluminous body of research reported which deals with educational aspirations and expectations (See Kuvlesky and

Reynolds, 1970), by comparison, there is truly a paucity of research looking at these same aspects considering the racial make-up of schools attended by those populations studied. Although much of the work done on educational aspirations and expectations has considered race, very little of it has considered the segregation-desegregation dimension. (There are exceptions here, of course, reference to which may be found in the bibliographies of Weinberg, 1970, Jencks, 1972 and the present study.) Due to the generally segregated character of public schools in the United States, most researchers have considered racial make-up before considering the influence of dominant social class. Further, the information which has existed has usually been of a limited nature; especially that research which has been done on aspirations. Jencks points out both the lack of research which includes appreciable numbers of black students and the lack of longitudinal analyses (Jencks, 1972).

There are other problems encountered by the researcher who refers to extant studies --- that is, 'problems' arising due to studies which report conflicting findings, poor designs, poor data sets, different inferences each of which may be theoretically plausible, etc. Examples of these problems are abundant. (For a good overview of this type of thing, see Weinberg (1970), especially Chapter 2, "Aspirations and Self Concept.") (1) When individuals with similar family backgrounds and test scores were compared, the aspirations of students in predominantly white and predominantly black schools were very nearly the same. (Jencks, 1972; also see Riley and Cohen, 1969; Armor, 1967.)

(2) As one might expect, aspirations are reported to be lower in working-class than in middle-class schools; but aspirations seem to be higher in black working-class schools than they are in white working-class schools. (Jencks, 1972). (3) Finally, it is not clear exactly how the desegregation experience may affect the way blacks perceive their life-chances. It may make black students more optimistic about the future, but if too much negativity is encountered from students and teachers the desegregation experience may have the opposite effect. (Jencks, 1972).

In summary, the research on desegregation is replete with ambiguity (and the research referred to by Jencks receives additional support in the section below on "Propositions"). Theoretical arguments, both pro and con, can be put forth about the possible effects of school desegregation, however any conclusions other than tentative ones are problematic and probably unwarranted. To quote Jencks,

> There is still a real need for studies of districts where high schools have been desegregated by court order or by deliberate administrative changes in attendance patterns... the most reasonable assumption at present is that desegregation makes little or no difference...(Jencks, 1972:155)

PROPOSITIONS

In the present study, the sample has been limited to youth from three rural counties and only those youth with parental SES scores, using the Duncan socioeconomic index (1961), of equal to or less

than 45 have been included.[1] As will be discussed in greater detail below, these schools would not generally be considered to be providing a middle-class milieu; they are located in rural areas with predominantly lower-class or working-class youth attending them. Within these parameters, it is possible to be somewhat more precise with our propositions. In fact, each proposition is meant to be implicitly prefaced by "Controlling for SES and (nonmetropolitan) place of residence..."

The main limitations of referring to extant literature in formulating research propositions about desegregation are (1) the lack of referable studies available and (2) the shortcomings of those usable studies found. Even in the two best bibliographic sources on desegregation to date, the bulk of research reports cited refer to comparisons of segregated populations; that is, if comparisons are made at all, they are most often between blacks and whites who have attended, respectively, either all black or all white schools. Rare is the study that truly considers the effects of racial desegregation.

It is generally conceded that blacks will have educational aspirations equal to or greater than those of whites. (In addition to Jencks, 1972; Riley and Cohen, 1969; and Armor, 1967; also see, for example, Boyd, 1952; Wilson, 1959; Blake, 1960; Geisel, 1962; Gottlieb, 1967. A good bibliographic reference on this is Kuvlesky and Reynolds, 1970.) Thus in the present study we have chosen to ignore this to concentrate specifically

---

[1] By limiting the analysis to only those youth with parental SEI scores of less than 45, greater homogeneity was maintained. As discussed below, this is potentially important from the standpoint of experimentation (i.e., maximizing homogeneity in the experimental and control groups). Further justification is found for this procedure when considering that this purifying of the experiment resulted in a loss of only eight youths.

on the segregation-desegregation dimension as it affects segregated and desegregated blacks. When we consider only these groups, the literature to which we can refer becomes even more scanty. There are, however, some studies relevant for present purposes and it is to these studies that we refer in stating the research propositions to be tested in this paper.

It has been previously noted that the findings we have to date are both limited and confusing. It is precisely this ambiguity which has led Jencks and others to so often conclude in a tentative fashion. A good example of this is found in an analysis of the possible effects of a positive versus negative environment (Jencks, 1972:98; Gottlieb, 1964; Pettigrew, 1964; Crain, 1971; Cohen et al., 1972). The dilemma faced here is of particular relevance for black youth. Desegregation and a positive environment might lead to blacks having higher aspirations; however if a negative environment were encountered, the effect could be one of repressing aspirations. Conversely, segregation may provide greater peer group support and a more positive environment but on the other hand, segregation may provide a negative environment from the standpoint of more negative reinforcement about upwardly mobile attitudes. A third alternative would be that desegregation would have no measurable impact one way or the other. Considering these conflicting suppositions the following propositions were constructed:

Proposition I: The educational aspirations of segregated and desegregated black youth will not be significantly different.

Proposition II: The educational expectations of segregated and desegregated black youth will not be significantly different.

To further test for differences which might occur due to segregation or desegregation, two other propositions were constructed. The intent in this case was to see if either group saw "race" or "schools gone to" as a significant blocking factor. The earlier citation of Gottlieb (1964), Pettigrew (1964), Crain (1971), Cohen et al., (1972), and Jencks (1972) is again applicable. The assumption is that in either the segregated or desegregated schools, any positive effects are in some way offset by negative effects. This leads to asking the question, "Is the segregated or desegregated group more or less pessimistic about the effects of race and schools attended?" Imputing a kind of universal awareness of racial discrimination on the part of blacks, the following proposition was tested:

Proposition III: Race will be perceived as a blocking factor equally by segregated and desegregated black youth.

It could be assumed with some justification (See Coleman, 1966 and Guthrie, 1971) that the schools attended by segregated blacks will generally be of poorer quality than the schools attended by segregated or desegregated whites; that is, they may be more poorly funded, staffed with poorer teachers, etc. Since this seemed to generally be the case in the rural areas from which our panel was drawn, it was assumed that blacks who began attending desegregated schools would have access to a generally better (although not necessarily more positive) educational environment than their segregated counterparts. Considering this, the following proposition was constructed:

Proposition IV: Segregated black youth will perceive schools attended as a blocking factor significantly more intensely than desegregated black youth.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STUDY SITE

Information used in this analysis was obtained by combining data collected from a panel of high school sophomores (Wave I-1966) and seniors (Wave II-1968) conducted by Kuvlesky and his colleagues with a recent post-high school follow-up study four years after high school (Wave III-1972). The original high school study, sometimes referred to in the literature as the East Texas Youth Study (See Cosby and Kuvlesky, 1972 for a bibliography of resulting reports), was concerned in general with the formation and change of selected mobility-linked attitudes among rural youth. The 1972 follow-up was essentially an extension of the first studies into the early adult years.

The three counties which constitute the study site were selected as a result of the high proportion of rural residents and the high proportion of blacks in the population. Each county was classified as 100% rural by the 1960 U.S. Census and each had a substantial black population, (percentage black ranged from 31% to 51% in 1960). Each county also had a heavy dependency on agricultural enterprises, and each had experienced little industrialization -- there was only one firm in any of the three counties that employed more than twenty workers in 1964. As would follow, all three counties had a recent history of high rates of out-migration of their youth to metropolitan centers. Among the other indicators of the social and economic conditions prevalent in the study area were: (1) a stable or declining population between the 1960 and 1970 census; (2) a low median level of education with relatively few high school graduates (in neither of the three counties had more than one quarter of the population graduated

from high school) and (3) a low median level of income (median income in 1960 ranged from a low of $1737 to a high of $2875).

In the initial 1966 contact, data were collected by interviewing all sophomores present the day of the interview in all schools in the three counties. There were at this period thirteen segregated black high schools, nine segregated white high schools and one desegregated high school for a total of 23 schools in the study area. As might be expected from the aforementioned discussion of demographic characteristics, the schools generally "suffered" from a lack of facilities normally associated with what might be considered a "quality education." Subjectively, the physical plants, equipment, classroom materials, curricula, and counseling services were substandard. The severity of conditions for some of these schools can be illustrated by the observation that several were inaccessible in wet weather and some relied on the use of out-door toilets. Generally, black schools were considered to have poorer facilities than those observed for whites.

In 1968, second wave interviews were carried out with the same students when most were high school seniors. Again from a subjective basis, improvement in the general conditions of schools was slight or unnoticeable. There was, however, one drastic and clearly observable change. Several of the previously segregated high schools had become desegregated. That is, six of the segregated black high schools and six of the segregated white high schools had desegregated in the interim. In addition, three of the white schools and five of the black schools remained segregated in 1968. Also two of the original black schools had been closed by 1968 and merged with other segregated black schools.

DESIGN OF THE RESEARCH: AN ACCIDENTAL QUASI-EXPERIMENT FIELD STUDY

During the third wave (1972) interviews with the panel, it became apparent that the data set afforded an excellent opportunity to assess the effects of initial desegregation on the formation of mobility-linked attitudes. An "after the fact" examination of both the introduction of the new policy of desegregation between the sophomore and senior data waves along with the timing of and the procedure used in our data collection has led us to the opinion that we had, in effect, the unusual opportunity to analyze both the short- and long-run effects of desegregation on this panel in a near-experimental situation. We have chosen to characterize the resulting design as an accidental quasi-experiment. It was accidental in that neither the problem nor the design was anticipated prior to the collection of data. It was considered quasi-experimental in that several but not all of the conditions necessary for rigorous field experimentation were present (for a discussion of such issues see: Campbell, 1957, and Campbell and Stanley, 1963). Illustration 1 presents the conditions of the Quasi-Experimental Situation.

(Illustration 1 here)

BEFORE MEASUREMENT (SOPHOMORES, 1966)

For the purpose of our experimental analysis of desegregation, the 1966 sophomore survey was considered to provide the basis for before-observations. Actually at the time of the sophomore interviewing, one of the twenty-three schools in the study area had already desegregated.

Students who attended this one desegregated school in 1966 were deleted and not considered further in the analysis. Recalling that this report considers only black students, our before-measurements consisted of observations of mobility attitudes of all black students present in the thirteen segregated black high schools just prior to the partial introduction of the policy of desegregation.

AFTER-MEASUREMENTS, SHORT-RUN EFFECTS (SENIORS, 1968)

In 1968, second wave interviews were conducted with the same panel of students who had participated in the sophomore survey. In the two year period that had elapsed between the two contacts, twelve of the schools in the study area had desegregated. Thus, we were in the fortunate situation of having measured mobility attitudes just prior to and just after the introduction of the desegregation policy. These after-measurements (Wave II) were considered to give us the potential for estimating short-run effects of desegregation on mobility-linked attitudes.

AFTER-MEASUREMENTS, LONG-RUN EFFECTS (POST-HIGH SCHOOL, 1972)

In 1972, third wave interviews were conducted with the same panel of students when they were four years beyond the normal date of high school graduation. This third wave contact was considered to provide the additional information needed for a second and long-run estimate of the effects of desegregation on mobility-linked attitudes. By comparing effects observed at Wave II and Wave III, it would be possible to distinguish between relatively temporary and lasting effects of the desegregation experience.

EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUP DETERMINATION

It should be recalled that at the sophomore interviews, all students who were included in the analysis had been attending segregated schools. However, by the senior year of high school the introduction of desegregation had occurred resulting in the observation (Wave II) that about 50% of the students were attending desegregated schools and 50% still remained in their previously segregated situation. The desegregated-segregated groups obtained in the senior wave (1968) make up our quasi-experimental and quasi-control groups.[2]

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

In keeping with the design employed and the propositions stated earlier in this report, simple analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedures were applied to the differences between the various experimental and control group means i.e., intra-race differences between experimental and control group means were tested. For convenience, the .05 level of significance was selected for statistical decisions. Means, standard deviations, F-ratios and significance levels were reported for each comparison.

---

[2]From an experimental point of view, the factors involved in the determination of the quasi-experimental and control groups represented the greatest departure of the present design from that of "pure" experimentation. Since the design was in large-part accidental, the desirable procedures of randomization and perhaps matching of students was not utilized. It is doubtful that the local school boards would have allowed such procedures even if the study had been proposed in 1966. Nevertheless, since there was an absence of randomization and matching, the question of possible bias in the selection of students for either segregated or desegregated groups becomes a concern. That is, we would like to assume that the desegregation experience was the only unique variable (all other things being equal) introduced to the experimental but not to the control group.

MEASURES

The following procedures were used to operationalize the variables included in the subsequent analysis. When repeated measures were taken across the three contact period, identical measurement procedures were used.

(1) *Main Breadwinner Occupation (1966)*: This variable was determined by asking the respondent to indicate the occupation held by the family's main breadwinner. The responses were coded according to the Duncan Socio-Economic Index (SEI).

(2) *Educational Aspirations (1966, 1968, and 1972)*: The respondents were asked the following question:

1= Quit school right now.

2= Complete high school.

3= Complete a business, commercial, electronics, or some other technical program after finishing high school.

4= Graduate from a junior college (2 years).

5= Graduate from a college or university.

6= Complete additional studies after graduating from a college or university.

(3) *Educational Expectations (1966, 1968 and 1972)*: The respondents were asked the following question with the same responses and coding procedure as above.

"Sometimes we are not always able to have as much education as we would like. How much education do you really expect to have?"

(4) *Goal Blockage--Race (1966, 1968 and 1972)*: The respondents were asked: "How much effect do you think each of the following things

will have in keeping you from getting the job you desire?" One of the items listed was "My race". The strength of response was again coded on a forced-choice format as follows:

1= None

2= Some

3= Much

4= Very Much

(5) *Goal Blockage--School Attended (1966, 1968 and 1972):* Measures for a second blockage factor, "The effect of the schools I have gone to" was determined in the same manner as for race goal blockage.

RESULTS

Analysis of Proposition I:

It was posited here that the educational aspirations of segregated and desegregated black youth would not be significantly different. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) for the 1966 data, prior to the students actually being dichotomized, revealed that those students who were to eventually attend desegregated schools had higher aspirations than those students who were to attend segregated schools ($\bar{X}_1 = 4.59$ compared to $\bar{X}'_1 = 4.13$); this difference, however, was not of statistical significance ($F = 3.12$, $P < .08$). In 1968 and 1972, the ANOVA revealed a small F-value and corresponding probability ($F = 1.20$, $P = .28$; $F = .32$, $P < .58$). Thus while there was a fairly sharp difference in the pre-desegregation year, there was no significant difference observed in either 1968 or 1972.

Analysis of Proposition II:

This proposition posited that the educational expectations of

segregated and desegregated black youth would not be significantly different. The proposition was accepted at all three points in time--no significant differences were observed: 1966, $F = .07$, $P < .79$; 1968 $F = .01$, $P < .92$; $F = .39$, $P < .54$.

(TABLE I here)

Analysis of Proposition III:

In this proposition it was posited that race as a blockage factor would be perceived equally by segregated and desegregated black youth. This proposition was not supported. In the pre-desegregation measure (1966), no difference was observed ($F = .05$, $P < .82$). However, once desegregated had occurred, significant differences were found with desegregated blacks perceiving race as more detrimental than segregated blacks. This was true in both 1968 ($F = 7.94$, $P < .006$) and 1972 ($F = 3.73$, $P < .05$). We will defer additional comment on this until the "Discussion" section.

Analysis of Proposition IV:

This proposition posited that segregated black youth would perceive the schools attended as a blocking factor significantly more intensely than desegregated black youth. While there can be no clear conclusion on this proposition, what was found contradicted the proposition as stated. Although no difference was observed in the pre-desegregation period ($F = .46$, $P < .51$), a difference of statistical significance was observed in 1968 ($F = 4.42$, $P < .04$). The important thing to be noted here was that it was the <u>desegregated</u> not the segregated blacks who saw schools attended as comparatively more detrimental; this was the opposite of what had been posited. The difference observed in 1972 was not of statistical significance ($F = .21$, $P < .65$).

(TABLE II here)

DISCUSSION

It should be recalled from the earlier review and discussion of school desegregation literature that there appears to be three general lines of thought concerning the likely social mobility consequences of the desegregation experience for black youth. As a point of clarification, the reader should be aware that by desegregation experiences reference is explicitly made to youth who have experienced a change from previously segregated to desegregated school situations. The three positions can be outlined (admittedly in over-generalized form) as follows:

(1) The desegregation experience will enhance the mobility chances of black youth by exposing the effected youth to a "superior" school situation that in turn through various processes increases and broadens the students' opportunity for attainment of higher level educational and occupational goals. The advocates of this position typically stress the significance of equal opportunity, the positive aspects of new socialization patterns, improved quality of teaching and educational facilities, and the formation of attitudes conducive to higher attainment levels.

(2) A second and counter position maintains that the black youth who enter the desegregated school situation will, in the aggregate, suffer negative consequences as a result of direct competition and comparisons with white youth who are already better prepared and more advantaged in terms of factors associated with higher attainment. Advocates of this position tend to view these negative influences as the short-run cost of desegregation which will diminish as inequalities in mobility statuses of blacks and whites decrease. The position tends to be associated with such explanations as relative deprivation, inter-racial competition-conflict, and self-concept formation.

(3) The third and most controversial point of view is that existing research does not support either of the first two positions in a convincing manner. In fact, it is maintained that the effects of desegregation (as a special case of school affects) on social mobility are apparently minimal. Advocates here play down the role of education in attainment and argue that the schools have proven to be of minor importance in reducing inequality when compared with familial and SES considerations.

When the findings of this study were taken collectively and considered in terms of the three aforementioned perspectives, for black youth, it was apparent that our study tended to support the third generalization. That is, the desegregation experience in our youth panel was found to have a negligible effect on the formation of measured mobility-linked attitudes. More specifically, in each comparison between desegregated (experimental) and segregated (control) groups, the analysis failed to reveal significant differences in mobility-linked attitudes. Group differences in educational aspirations and in educational expectations did not occur in the short-run (high school senior year) or in the long-run (four years after high school). The consistency of these results clearly strengthens the position that stipulates the minimal influence of the desegregation experience on social mobility, at least as indicated by mobility-linked attitudes and thus supports Propositions I and II. Put in as positive a manner as possible, we may tentatively conclude here that while the desegregation experience did not raise aspirations or expectations, neither did it suppress them. Thus the desegregation experience had neither a positive nor negative effect on mobility-linked attitudes but rather a neutral effect.

There were, however, differences observed between the segregated and desegregated groups in terms of their perception of factors that would block the attainment of occupational goals. The desegregated black group both in the short-run and in the long-run was more likely to view race as a blockage factor. The largest difference occurred at the high school senior year and had diminished somewhat by the post-high school interview. This finding does suggest that desegregated black youth were more likely to define their occupational chances (and by inference, educational chances) in racial terms indicating an increasing awareness of possible racial discrimination resulting from desegregation. Interestingly, desegregated black youth, at least in the short-run, were more likely to view their school as a possible blockage factor. It is not clear whether the black youth were considering their total segregated and desegregated school experiences or their more immediate desegregated school experiences. In responding to this item, in the first case it would follow that the response could indicate a negative evaluation of their earlier segregated school situation, in light of current improved desegregation situations. In the second case, however, a contrary interpretation might apply, in that black youth were in this case negatively oriented to a white desegregated school situation; this argument would find support in the notion of the segregated student in the desegregated school. It should also be recalled that this difference between segregated and desegregated groups had disappeared by the third interview.

It should be apparent to those familiar with other desegregation studies that the present study tends to support the findings of Coleman

et al., and Jencks et al.; both of whom concluded that desegregation, in and of itself, has a marginal effect on students (whether black or white). The present study also tends to support the notion that the initial effects of desegregation may cause tension to increase; our finding on perception of race is especially salient here. Jencks had suggested in his study that desegregation might lead to an increase in tension in the short-run but a reduction of tension in the long-run. A finding which lends support to this is not necessarily negative but may merely reflect students' reaction to a new situation; in fact, to paraphrase W.I. Thomas, it may be a "new definition of a new situation." Thus the perception may be both real in terms of its definition, hence in terms of its perceived consequences. Theoretically, then, there is as much justification to assume decreasing tension as assimilation to the new situation becomes more complete, as there is to assume increasing or stable tension. At present, little can really be said about either perspective.

In evaluating the results of this study, the reader should be cautioned on several points. Although the research design was a quasi-experiment and the temporal scope of the data exceeds that of comparable studies, certain very desirable attributes of experimentation were absent. The most serious of these was the absence of randomization procedures in determining experimental and control groups, and of course, the inability of the researchers to manipulate the introduction of desegregation. Second, the research was conducted in three low-income rural

counties in Texas. There is no reason to believe the quality of the introduction of desegregation is directly comparable to non-rural groups or to deep South rural populations which have historically experienced greater difficulty in the process. Third, the facilities offered to youth in both segregated and desegregated situations may have been of approximately the same poor quality. If this latter point were time, the change for the black youth to previously all white schools would have resulted in no real change in these factors.

Illustration I. Conditions of the Quasi-Experimental Situation.

	Before Measures of Mobility Attitudes Sophomores 1966)	Experimental Treatment	Short Run, After Measurement of Mobility Attitudes (Seniors 1968)	Long Run, After Measurement of Mobility Attitudes (Post-High School 1972)
Quasi-Experiment Group	Black youth who will eventually experience desegregation	Introduction of the policy of desegregation	Black youth who had experienced desegregation	Black youth who had experienced desegregation
Quasi-Control Group	Black youth who will <u>not</u> eventually experience desegregation	Continuation of the policy of segregation	Black youth who had <u>not</u> experienced desegregation	Black youth who had <u>not</u> experienced desegregation

TABLE I

MOBILITY-LINKED ATTITUDES OF

SEGREGATED AND DESEGREGATED BLACK YOUTH

Variables and Time Measured	Experimental Group-Desegregated Youth			Control Group-Segregated Youth			Calculated Differences		
	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}'$	SD	N	$\bar{X}-\bar{X}'$	F	P <
Educational Aspirations (1966)	4.59	1.60	66	4.13	1.40	64	.46	3.12	.08
Educational Aspirations (1968)	4.15	1.28	65	4.42	1.46	62	-.29	1.20	.28
Educational Aspirations (1972)	4.94	1.28	66	5.06	1.22	64	-.12	.32	.58
Educational Expectations (1966)	4.26	1.59	66	4.19	1.45	64	.07	.07	.97
Educational Expectations (1968)	3.89	1.28	66	3.87	1.34	62	.02	.01	.92
Educational Expectations (1972)	3.97	1.28	66	3.81	1.41	64	.16	.39	.54

TABLE II

PERCEIVED GOAL-BLOCKAGE OF

SEGREGATED AND DESEGREGATED BLACK YOUTH

Variables and Time Measured	Experimental Group-Desegregated Youth			Control Group-Segregated Youth			Calculated Differences		
	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}'$	SD	N	$\bar{X}-\bar{X}'$	F	P <
Race Blockage (1966)	1.78	1.17	63	1.73	1.01	64	.05	.05	.82
Race Blockage (1968)	1.92	1.09	61	1.43	.83	61	.49	7.94	.006
Race Blockage (1972)	1.49	.8.	66	1.23	.61	64	.26	3.73	.05
School Blockage (1966)	1.92	1.02	63	1.79	1.13	62	.13	.46	.51
School Blockage (1968)	1.80	.96	61	1.48	.74	61	.32	4.42	.04
School Blockage (1972)	1.59	.96	66	1.67	.92	63	-.08	.21	.65

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Armor, David
1967 "The racial composition of schools and college aspirations of negro students." In U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, Vol. 2, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Blake, Elias, Jr.
1960 A Comparison of Intra-racial and Inter-racial Levels of Aspirations, (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Illinois) University Microfilms Order No. 60-1616.

Blau, Peter M., et al.
1956 "Occupational choice: a conceptual framework." Industrial and Labor Relations Review, No. 4:9, 531-543.

Boyd, G.F.
1952 "The levels of aspirations of white and negro children in a non-segregated elementary school." Journal of Social Psychology 36.

Campbell, Donald T.
1957 "Factors relevant to the validity of experiments in social settings." Psychological Bulletin 54:297-312.

Campbell, Donald T. and Julian C. Stanley
1963 Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research Chicago: Rand McNally & Company.

Carter, Hodding
1964 "Desegregation does not mean integration." Pp. 134-139 in Hubert H. Humprey, School Desegregation: Documents and Commentaries. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company.

Cohen, David K., Thomas F. Pettigrew, and Robert T. Riley
1972 "Race and the outcomes of schooling." Pp. 343-368 in Frederick Mosteller and Daniel P. Moynihan, On Equality of Educational Opportunity. New York: Vintage Books.

Coleman, James S., et al.
1966 Equality of Educational Opportunity. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Coleman, James S.
1969 "The concept of equality of educational opportunity." Pp. 9-24 in the Editorial Board of the Harvard Educational Review, Equal Educational Opportunity. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Cosby, Arthur G., et al.
1973 Youth Status Projections in the South: Structured Annotations of Research Literature from Regional Research Project S-61. College Station: Texas A&M University, Dept. of Ag. Eco. and Rural Soc., DIR 73-2.

Cosby, Arthur G. and William P. Kuvlesky
1972 "Development of human resource potentials of rural youth in the south and their patterns of mobility." Unpublished bibliography of research reports from Texas Agricultural Experiment Station Project H-2811.

Crain, Robert L.
1971 "School integration and the academic achievement of negroes." Sociology of Education 44 (Winter): 1-26.

Duncan, Otis D.
1961 "A Socio-economic index for all occupations." Pp. 109-161 and Appendix B in Albert J. Reiss Jrs., Otis D. Duncan, Paul K. Hatt, and C.C. North, Occupations and Social Status. Glencoe: The Free Press.

Geisel, Paul N.
1962 I.Q. Performance, Educational and Occupational Aspirations of Youth in a Southern City: A Racial Comparison. (Doctoral Dissertation, Vanderbilt University) University Microfilm Order No. 63-1838.

Ginzberg, Eli., et al.
1951 Occupational Choice: An Approach to a General Theory. New York: Columbia University Press.

Gordon, Edmund W.
1972 "Toward defining equality of educational opportunity." Pp. 423-434 in Frederick Mosteller and Daniel P. Moynihan, On Equality of Educational Opportunity. New York: Vintage Books.

Gottlieb, David
1964 "Goal aspirations and goal fulfillments: differences between deprived and affluent american adolescents." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Orthopsychiatris Association (March).

Guthrie, James W., et al.
1971 Schools and Inequality. Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press

Jencks, Christopher., et al.
1972 Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effects of Family and Schooling in America. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Knapp, Melvin and Eliot Hammer
1970 "Racial composition of southern schools and adolescent educational and occupational aspirations and expectations." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Southern Agricultural Workers, Memphis (January).

Kuvlesky, William P. and Robert C. Bealer
1966 "Clarification of the concept 'occupational choice'." Rural Sociology 31 (September): 265-276.

Laurenti, Luigi
1960 Property Value and Race. Berkeley: University of California Press.

McPartland, James
1968 "The segregated student in desegregated schools." Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, Report No. 21 (June).

Mosteller, Frederick and Daniel P. Moynihan
1972 On Equality of Educational Opportunity. New York: Vintage Books.

Musgrave, Peter W.
1967 "Towards a sociological theory of occupational choice." Sociological Review 15 (March): 33-46.

Pettigrew, Thomas F.
1969 "Race and equal educational opportunity." Pp. 69-79 in the Editorial Board of the Harvard Educational Review, Equal Educational Opportunity. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Rehberg, Richard A.
1967 "Adolescent career aspirations and expectations: evaluation of two contrary stratification hypotheses." Pacific Sociological Review (Fall): 81-90.

Riley, Robert R. and David K. Cohen
1969 "Comparison or conformity: the effect of school environments on educational aspirations." Harvard Center for Educational Policy Research.

Rodgers, Roy H.
1966 "The occupational role of the child: a research frontier in the developmental conceptual framework." Social Forces 45 (December): 217-224.

Sewell, William H., Archibald O. Haller, and George W. Ohlendorf
1970 "The educational and early occupational status attainment process: replication and revision." American Sociological Review 35 (December): 1014-1027.

Sewell, William H., Archibald O. Haller, and Alejandro Portes
1969 "The educational and early occupation status attainment processes." American Sociological Review 34 (February): 82-92.

St. John, Nancy H.
1970 "Desegregation and minority groups performance." Review of Educational Research 40 (February): 111-133.

Super, Donald E.
1957 The Psychology of Development. New York: Harper.

Weinberg, Meyer
1968 Integrated Education. Beverly Hills: The Glencoe Press.

Weinberg, Meyer
1970 Desegregation Research: An Appraisal. Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa.

Wilson, Alan B.
1959 "Residential segregation of social classes and aspirations of high school boys." American Sociological Review 24 (December): 843-854.